Case3:12-cv-05667-EMC Document289 Filed08/02/14 Page1 of 3

- 3. Dkt. 272 issue three (sufficiency of Abhyanker's declaration about missing documents, dkt. 264, in response to prior Court order). Plaintiff's request is granted. Abhyanker's vague declaration is insufficient. Abhyanker must refile a declaration under penalty of perjury by August 8, specifically answering the inquiries set forth in dkt. 272 at page 4. A further failure may subject the defense to sanctions.
- 4. Dkt. 272 issue four (Abhyanker tax returns for 2006-2009 which do not redact signatures, dates, and preparer information). This Court previously ordered Abhyanker to produce portions of his tax returns, subject to a protective order. The relevant purpose of this discovery was to explore whether he took deductions or losses related to LegalForce. The Court now grants plaintiff's request for further relief. Signatures, dates and preparer information are needed for context and completeness. The tax returns must be produced by noon on August 4.
- 5. Abhyanker's request to continue his August 4 deposition: denied.
- 6. Dkt. 281 (plaintiff's request for forensic examination of selected devices from Abhyanker). This request substantially is based on plaintiff's charges of evidence fabrication and spoliation by the defense. There is good reason for concern. But at this point, the turnover of specific devices for inspection is denied. The Court, in this and prior orders, is compelling discovery that may demonstrate the alleged spoliation. On balance, the Court finds that the likely benefit of discovering relevant information on the devices is outweighed by the burden of turning over devices to the other side. The Court is concerned that the request is overly broad and cumulative, given the many other discovery requests made by plaintiff in the final week of the discovery period.
- 7. Dkt. 283 (Abhyanker's privilege log): Plaintiff's request to compel a proper privilege log is granted. By August 7 at 5:00 p.m. the defense must file a revised log that specifically and sufficiently established the privilege for each

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

document, and attachment, on the log. Any responsive documents on the log that the defense determines (after reviewing the objections made by plaintiff in docket 283) are not privileged must be produced by August 3 at noon. If the revised August 7 log is still deficient, the parties must meet and confer and file a joint letter brief by August 14.

8. Finally, the parties presented at the hearing a dispute concerning production of duplicate documents. They are to meet and confer and submit a joint brief by August 6 on this issue.

Any party may object to this order to District Court Judge Edward M. Chen within 14 days. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: August 1, 2014

Nathanael M. Cousins United States Magistrate Judge